

I'm appalled at the actions of Sinclair Broadcasting Company and their drastic tilt to reporting - and distorting - the Presidential election. Their decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. They are an obvious example of what can happen when large companies control the airwaves: the result is that we, the public, get less balanced reporting and more of what the ownership believes is in their best interest.

Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter. It's also critical that such an obvious pro-Republican piece be balanced with an "equal time" pro-Democratic piece. I still have yet to hear that Sinclair is willing to offer such balance.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. Their actions also demonstrate why the license renewal process needs to involve a real review of the company's service of the public interest and of the democratic process.

Thank you.